(a) whether it is a fact that a number of employees had filed a number of cases against the management of the State Bank of India, Regional Office, Meerut (U.P.) with the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi during 1985 for their wrongful removal from service;

(b) whether it is also a fact that in this order dated 23-2-87 (I.D. 38/85) the Labour Court had decided in favour of some SC/ST employees;

(c) whether it is also a fact that these | SC/ST employees have not so far been reinstated in their services by the State i Bank of India, Regional Office, Meerut! despite the order in their favour; and

(d) if so, what are the reasons therefor | and what steps have been taken by Government for the reinstatement for these employees ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE) MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL; SHASTRI) : (a) to (d) The SBI have reported that only one employee belonging | to SC community had filed a case against I the management of the SBI Zonal Office, Meerut with the Presiding Officer, Central Governmnent Industrial Tribunal-cum Labour Court, New Delhi during 1985. The person is reported to be involved in a case of misappropriation. The Tribunal had held the Bank's action in discharging him as non-maintainable. The SBI is, however, of the view that the award of the Tribunal is erroneous. The Bank has since obtained a stay against the operation of the Award from the High Court of I Delhi. The matter is, therefore, subjudice.

Celling on Government Borrowings

3457. SHRI SURESH PACHOURI : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether he has suggested that a ceiling be imposed on Government borrowings, both internal and external, under Article 292 of the Constitution;

(b) if so, what are the main reasons therefor; and

(c) by when a final decision in the matter is likely to be taken ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI) : (a) to (c) To curb the growth of internal and external debt one of the suggestions was to have a ceiling imposed through a law under article 292 of the Constitution. The pros and cons of this suggestion are still under consideration of Government.

Import of DMT Plant by M/s. Bombay Dyeing

3458. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether Bombay Dyeing had negotiated the import of DMT plant of 60,000 tonnes capacity at about $ 9 million;

(b) whether it is a fact that the ICICI, the financing agency for the second plant, had actually remitted $ 10 million between the years 1982-85 to the suppliers
of the plant, bearing a balance of $ 1 million in foreign exchange for the company; and

(c) if so, what action Government have taken against the company for violation of the FERA provisions ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI) : (a) and (b) M/s. Bombay Dyeing Mfg. Co. Ltd., imported a second hand DMT plant of 60,000 tonnes capacity from U.S.A. The cost of the base plant at $ 10 million was paid through ICICI and SBI in terms of Bridge loan but certain residual items valued at $ 8,86,941 were not brought into India.

(c) Adjudication proceedings have been initiated against the company and Shri Nusli Wadia by issue of a Show Cause Notice on 18-5-90 for violation of the provisions of Sections 8(3) and 8(4) of the F.E.R. Act, 1973, to the extent of U.S. $ 8,86,941.